



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/399,873	09/20/1999	FRANK FADO	6169-95	2778

7590 05/08/2002

GREGORY A NELSON
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
222 LAKEVIEW AVENUE SUITE 400
P O BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 334023188

EXAMINER

ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/399,873

Applicant(s)

FADO ET AL.

Examiner

Angela A. Armstrong

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,499 to Lewis et al, herein after referred to as Lewis, in view of Kawada et al, JP41009184A, herein after referred to as Kawada.

Lewis claims methods, a system and machine-readable storage for responding to noises in a speech recognition system.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Lewis provides monitoring a system of a computer, a computer user and the environment, detecting background noises, environmental noises and computer noises which may occur while a person uses a voice recognition application program, identifying the noises that occur and performing an action or task in response to the identified noise of the system, which reads on "computer system" and "component" of the system. Lewis claims identifying and recording of randomly occurring noises in claims 1, 5, and 9, which reads on "recording a silence sample" and "recording an isolated noise sample while operating a

Art Unit: 2654

computer system component in isolation from other computer system components". Lewis also claims determining when a randomly occurring noise selected from a group of noises has been received in claims 1, 5, and 9, which reads on "attributing said isolated noise sample to said isolated computer component".

Lewis does not specifically teach comparing the sounds to a preset threshold in determining which randomly occurring noise has been received. In a similar field of endeavor, Kawada teaches comparing the power level of an input signal to a threshold value and determining if the signal is sound or silence if the power level exceeds or falls below a set threshold (section entitled Solution), which reads on "comparing signal characteristics of a silence sample with signal characteristics of said isolated noise sample" and "said signal characteristics of said silence sample differ by a preset threshold from said signal characteristics of said isolated sample". Kawada teach that such a system is advantageous in preventing a sound detector from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals (section entitled Problem to be Solved).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the noise recognizer in the speech recognition system of Lewis to provide for distinguishing between sounds and silence using a comparison based on a threshold criteria, as taught by Kawada, for the purpose of preventing the speech recognition system from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals, as suggested by Kawada.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Lewis claims identifying and recording of randomly occurring noises in claims 1, 5, and 9, which reads on "logging said signal characteristics of said silence sample and said isolated noise sample". Lewis also claims determining when a randomly

Art Unit: 2654

occurring noise selected from a group of noises has been received in claims 1, 5, and 9, which reads on “reporting excess noise identified in said identifying step”. Lewis further claims mapping or assigning a predefined action to be performed if a randomly occurring noise has been identified in claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-11, which reads on “suggesting a remedy for said identified excess noise”.

Regarding claims 3-6 and 9-12, Lewis claims that the noises to be detected are selected from the group consisting of keyboard noises and a telephone ringing in claims 4 and 8, which reads on “creating a list of computer system components to be tested for excess noise”.

Lewis claims identifying and recording of randomly occurring noises in claims 1, 5, and 9, which reads on “recording an isolated noise sample while operating a computer system component in said created list according said corresponding method”.

Lewis does not specifically teach a corresponding method for testing for excess noise. In a similar field of endeavor, Kawada teaches comparing the power level of an input signal to a threshold value and determining if the signal is sound or silence if the power level exceeds or falls below a set threshold (section entitled Solution), which reads on “comparing signal characteristics of a silence sample with signal characteristics of said isolated noise sample” and “said signal characteristics of said silence sample differ by a preset threshold from said signal characteristics of said isolated sample”. Kawada teach that such a system is advantageous in preventing a sound detector from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals (section entitled Problem to be Solved).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the noise recognizer in the speech recognition system of Lewis to provide for a method

Art Unit: 2654

for testing a component for excess noise, as taught by Kawada, for the purpose of preventing the speech recognition system from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals, as suggested by Kawada.

Additionally, Lewis further claims mapping or assigning a predefined action to be performed if a randomly occurring noise has been identified in claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-11, which reads on "suggesting said corresponding remedy for said identified excess noise in each said computer system component in said created list".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2 and 5-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "said identifying step" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. To correct the insufficient antecedent basis, applicant is advised to provide an "identifying step" prior to the recitation of the "said identifying step" in line 4.

Claims 5 and 6 recites the limitation "said second recording step" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. To correct the insufficient

Art Unit: 2654

antecedent basis, applicant is advised to provide a "second recording step" prior to the recitation of the "said second recording step" in line 1 of claims 5 and 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lewis et al (US Patent No. 6,324,499), herein after referred to as Lewis, in view of Kawada et al, JP41009184A, herein after referred to as Kawada.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this

Art Unit: 2654

rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Lewis discloses methods, a system and machine-readable storage for responding to noises in a speech recognition system.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Lewis provides monitoring a system of a computer, a computer user and the environment, detecting background noises, environmental noises and computer noises which may occur while a person uses a voice recognition application program, identifying the noises that occur and performing an action or task in response to the identified noise of the system at col. 1, line 55 continuing to col. 2, line 36, which reads on “computer system” and “component” of the system. Lewis discloses identifying and recording of non-speech sounds at col. 4, lines 20-23 and lines 49-53, which reads on “recording a silence sample” and “recording an isolated noise sample while operating a computer system component in isolation from other computer system components”. Lewis also discloses determining when a randomly occurring noise selected from a group of noises has been received at col. 4, lines 24-25, which reads on “attributing said isolated noise sample to said isolated computer component”.

Lewis does not specifically teach comparing the sounds to a preset threshold in determining which randomly occurring noise has been received. In a similar field of endeavor, Kawada teaches comparing the power level of an input signal to a threshold value and determining if the signal is sound or silence if the power level exceeds or falls below a set threshold (section entitled Solution), which reads on “comparing signal characteristics of a

Art Unit: 2654

silence sample with signal characteristics of said isolated noise sample” and “said signal characteristics of said silence sample differ by a preset threshold from said signal characteristics of said isolated sample”. Kawada teach that such a system is advantageous in preventing a sound detector from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals (section entitled Problem to be Solved).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the noise recognizer in the speech recognition system of Lewis to provide for distinguishing between sounds and silence using a comparison based on a threshold criteria, as taught by Kawada, for the purpose of preventing the speech recognition system from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals, as suggested by Kawada.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Lewis teaches everything as claimed in claim 1. Additionally, Lewis teaches identifying and recording of randomly occurring noises at col. 4, lines 20-23 and lines 49-53, which reads on “logging said signal characteristics of said silence sample and said isolated noise sample”. Lewis also discloses determining when a randomly occurring noise selected from a group of noises has been received at col. 4, lines 24-25, which reads on “reporting excess noise identified in said identifying step”. Lewis further discloses mapping or assigning a predefined action to be performed if a randomly occurring noise has been identified at col. 1, line 66 continuing to col. 2, line 8 and col.4, lines 59-62, which reads on “suggesting a remedy for said identified excess noise”.

Regarding claims 3-6 and 9-12, Lewis teaches everything as claimed in claim 1. Additionally, Lewis teaches that the noises to be detected are selected from the group consisting

Art Unit: 2654

of keyboard noises, breathing noises and a telephone ringing at col. 5, lines 4-6, which reads on “creating a list of computer system components to be tested for excess noise”.

Lewis teaches identifying and recording of a group of randomly occurring noises at col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 4, lines 20-23, and col. 4, lines 49-53, which reads on “recording an isolated noise sample while operating a computer system component in said created list according said corresponding method”.

Lewis does not specifically teach a particular method for testing for excess noise. In a similar field of endeavor, Kawada teaches comparing the power level of an input signal to a threshold value and determining if the signal is sound or silence if the power level exceeds or falls below a set threshold (section entitled Solution), which reads on “comparing signal characteristics of a silence sample with signal characteristics of said isolated noise sample” and “said signal characteristics of said silence sample differ by a preset threshold from said signal characteristics of said isolated sample”. Kawada teach that such a system is advantageous in preventing a sound detector from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals (section entitled Problem to be Solved).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the noise recognizer in the speech recognition system of Lewis to provide for a method for testing a component for excess noise, as taught by Kawada, for the purpose of preventing the speech recognition system from misjudging increased and sustained noise levels as desired sound signals, as suggested by Kawada.

Additionally, Lewis teaches mapping or assigning a predefined action to be performed if a randomly occurring noise has been identified at col. 1, line 66 continuing to col. 2, line 8 and

Art Unit: 2654

col. 4, lines 59-62, which reads on “suggesting said corresponding remedy for said identified excess noise in each said computer system component in said created list”.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shinotsuka et al (US Patent No. 6,301,559) discloses a speech recognition system and method, which limits erroneous recognition for sounds that are different from desired sounds by providing for recognition templates of characteristic parameters of ambient sounds.

Cason (US Patent No. 6,249,757) discloses a system for detecting speech, which distinguishes between silence and speech based on comparing input signals to selected threshold criteria.

Art Unit: 2654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

AAA
May 5, 2002



MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800